Application No. Applicant(s) 09/664,643 MIYASAKA, KOICHI Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2841 Jeremy C. Norris All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) David Talbot. (2) G. Gregory Schivley. (4)_____. Date of Interview: 01 March 2002. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: ____. Claim(s) discussed: 7-13. Identification of prior art discussed: JP 08-211398. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) ⋈ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Schivley requested an English translation of the JP document in order to best respond to the outstanding Office Action. Mr. Talbot stated that the file had been lost and suggested that Mr. Schively make a formal written request for the translation so that the translation would be provided once the file was located. Mr. Schively filed said formal request on 6 March 2002. The file did not appear as found with a response from Applicants on the Examiner's docket until September 2004. However, Applicants have since submitted an IDS from a counterpart JPO application which contains a translation of the JP document in question. Therefore, no additional translation is being sent. Since Applicants request for the translation was timely, the Examiner is re-sending the previous Office Action with a new time period for reply.